

HAMPTON PLANNING BOARD – MINUTES

July 16, 2003

PRESENT: Thomas Gillick, Chairman
Robert Viviano, Vice Chairman
Tracy Emerick, Clerk
Bill Bilodeau, Alternate
Tom Higgins
Jack Lessard
Keith Lessard
Jim Workman, Selectman Alternate

ABSENT:
Skip Sullivan, Selectman Member
Jennifer Kimball, Town Planner

Mr. Gillick called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. by introducing the Board members. Mr. Gillick then asked Mr. Workman to lead the Pledge of Allegiance.

I. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS:

1. 389 High Street Realty Trust (Jerome Sakurai)
Special Permit to remove a duplex and construct one 8-unit building
within the Wetland Conservation District at
389 High Street
Map 180, Lot 3A
Owners of Record: 389 High Street Realty Trust and Four B Realty Trust
2. 389 High Street Realty Trust (Jerome Sakurai)
Site Plan application to construct one 8-unit building and associated
Conditional Use Permit for development within the Aquifer Protection District at
389 High Street
Map 180, Lot 3A
Waiver Requested: Site Plan Regulations Section VII.D (Storm Drainage),
waiver only needed for Drainage Plan Option A
Owners of Record: 389 High Street Realty Trust and Four B Realty Trust
Jurisdiction Accepted June 4, 2003

Mr. Gillick announced the Board voted on July 2, 2003, to continue these applications to the August 6, 2003 meeting, at the request of the applicant.

3. Vertical Building & Development Company, LLC
Site Plan Review for 49 Unit Condominium with 2 retail stores
Discussion of the proposal in the context of the Hampton Beach Master Plan
Ocean Boulevard, J & K Streets
Map 293, Lot 008; Map 290, Lots 144, 145, & 146
Owners of Record: Nancy J. Higgins Revocable Trust; Five Jay Street, LLC;
Jerelyn A. Gray & Peter B. Dineen; Captain Morgan Inn, Inc.

Mr. Gillick gave a brief statement that this is not a discussion of the Hampton Beach Area Master Plan, but a discussion of the specific project, on this specific site, as it relates to the Master Plan. He read from the revised Statutes of the State of New Hampshire, Master Plan Purpose and Description - RSA 674:2 continued clarification.

It should be noted that Mr. Peter Saari, Attorney for the applicant, and Mr. Joseph Coronati of Jones & Beach Engineering were both present at this time. Mr. Gillick then asks for presentation from Mr. Stephen Yas. Mr. Yas, Architect for this project, began his presentation highlighting areas as follows:

- similarities with this project as with other developments in the area (Ashworth, Hampton House, etc...)
- density, height, set backs, etc...
- solar angle/sun studies; any shading from this project reaches the beach at 6:00 p.m., in the height of summer, when most sun worshippers are gone from the beach
- year round development as discussed in the Master Plan

Mr. Gillick asks if the Board has any questions of Mr. Yas: Mr. K. Lessard asks about the 90 parking spaces designated specifically to the residents, none for the proposed restaurant/retail. Mr. Yas responds, that is correct.

Mr. Gillick asks for the next presentation from Mr. Steve Cecil. Mr. Cecil, Architect and Urban Designer – his firm being responsible for the Hampton Beach Area Master Plan (November 2001), began his presentation highlighting areas as follows:

- overview of memo dated May 14, 2003 referencing features of the project do not conform to the Master Plan
- building design, scale, density, and consistency does not conform with the relationship of the surrounding area
- zoning height limit should be adhered to (50'); he notes a 50' flat roof structure is very different than a 50' peaked roof structure
- side streets and parcels around any future development should be a key area of consideration in future economic values
- solar angle/sun studies/shade; is not enormous during any given time of the day and any shading may be welcome during a hot summer day
- he cautioned the Board about setting a precedent; would they want the whole beach to look this way?
- the Master Plan is currently before the Town [the visual scale & character of this project not designed in context with a "coastal, clustered village].

Mr. Gillick asks if the Board has any questions of Mr. Cecil: Mr. Emerick asks his opinion with economic value of the area/district; what should be developed on this site. Mr. Viviano asks the benefit of a set-back being staggered; Mr. Higgins suggests it doesn't make sense to request variances to height just because on site parking has been accommodated – other buildings in the immediate area, that meet the 50' height limit, do not have on site parking; additionally, Mr. Higgins suggests this is a rare instance of ever getting four *lots* together;

Mr. McMahon makes a point of the West side having “views” as well; Mr. Workman agrees the character of this design would not be picked out as a ‘coastal, clustered community’; Mr. K. Lessard suggests there currently exists 19th century, nondescript architect and what would a multifamily building, with this density, look like to fit in that situation; Mr. K. Lessard also brings up the pedestrian accessibility, 60’ straight walls, and what type of set-back would be acceptable, and obstructions (trees) being 2’ from the curb.

Mr. Cecil answers high density along Ocean Boulevard will diminish the side streets to support a building of this size; the Town should consider perpendicular development of the waterfront to maximize values; there are infinite numbers of solutions here. With perpendicular/parallel streets it is difficult to maximize values for everyone concerned, and not everyone will have a water front view; the possibility exists to offer property owners more money than they could get otherwise by putting four, six, eight properties together. He reiterated, the density is an issue, a large building can take on a lot of characteristics – it is beneficial to work towards economical value. As for the side setbacks, continuous variety and interest is what keeps pedestrians moving along – rule of thumb, dated back to the 19th century, is a height to the width of no less than 2 high to 1 wide. However, he suggests to walk up and down some of the streets with a tape measure and attain a ‘feeling’ for the area setbacks from the street. Mr. Cecil does not have an answer as to what the setbacks on the side streets should be, but suggests larger than 5’.

Mr. Gillick offers Mr. Yas to comment on what has been said so far. Mr. Yas refers to a memo he wrote, dated July 9, 2003, and the possibility of misconceptions. Additionally, he continues to highlight: vision; economics of the Master Plan; sole control to manipulate properties; market value of the land; street trees do work on 5’ wide sidewalks; articulation in the façade offers pedestrian friendly walking; this project is in concert with the density of this community based on similar 10, 11, 12 units on a 5,000 sq. ft. lot; the quality of the fire prevention and suppression system is of the highest standards; the property tax return will be of maximum benefit as well.

OPEN PUBLIC HEARING:

Mr. Jack Kopka of 180 Drakeside Road introduced himself (he is the applicant for this project), stating his opinion that this project will enhance the Hampton Beach area and increase the property value of the surrounding abutters.

Mr. Charlie Preston of Glade Path introduced himself and proceeds to ask for a Board mandate as far as the height issues are concerned. Mr. Gillick answered that the Board is operating on regulations voted from the people of Hampton, the height restriction is 50’, and variances are granted through the Zoning Board of Adjustment.

Ms. Kim Barrone of 8 K Street introduced herself and asked to verify where the 10/12 unit housing are; she is aware of J & K Street having up to, no greater than 4 units. Additionally, structures built 5’ from her home is entirely too close; in agreement the beach is deteriorating, the project is beautiful, it just does not fit in this area.

Ms. Jeanne Lilienthal of 7 J Street introduced herself. She commented that not one person from this development has contacted her. Believes J Street fits the description ‘clustered community’ – everyone knows each other and watches out for each other. This project being built 4’ from her home will create problems of pulling out of her driveway without the risk of hitting somebody; cannot get father’s wheelchair past the trees. It matters this be the right project for the right place.

Mrs. Geannina Guzman-Scanlon of 4 J Street introduces herself. She is concerned about setting the precedent; the comparison of the Ashworth, the Casino, etc... these are all businesses, where the Majestic is to be multifamily housing – the difference is in the guidelines; suggests to make recommendations using commissions developed by the community.

Mr. Michael Scanlon of 4 J Street introduced himself. He begins by passing a picture of J Street dated circa 1920 where the street was 40' wide before the sidewalks were put in. Pictures of the retention wall at 6:30 p.m., from just the night before, were distributed as well. The elevator shaft will run 15' feet onto abutters' properties; concern is the density of having a 160,000 sq. ft. on a 29,000 sq. ft. lot; additionally feels there is misrepresentation regarding the plans of this project.

SUSPEND PUBLIC HEARING. The public hearing is scheduled to continue on July 30, 2003

II. CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES – July 2, 2003:

Mr. Gillick advised there was an error on Page 2 (re: Mary Maher) and the referenced RSA should read *RSA 676:4-a*.

Mr. Higgins stated Page 4 (re: Hampton Woods, LLC/Drakes Appleton Corp.) there were 5 *added units*.

Mr. J. Lessard **MOTIONED** to approve and amend the minutes as discussed. Mr. K. Lessard **SECONDED**. **VOTE: 5=YES. 3=ABSTAIN** (Mr. Emerick, Mr. Viviano & *Mr. Workman*). **MOTION PASSES IN THE AFFIRMATIVE.**

III. CORRESPONDENCE:

No correspondence to be discussed this evening.

IV. OTHER BUSINESS:

No other business to be discussed this evening.

Mr. J. Lessard **MOTIONED** to adjourn. Mr. Bilodeau **SECONDED**. **VOTE: All. MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY IN THE AFFIRMATIVE.**

Meeting adjourned at 9:05 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,
Janine L. Fortini
Planning Board Secretary

Minutes as amended July 30, 2003